PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.	International filing date *(day/month/year)*	Priority date *(day/month/year)*
PCT/GB2004/005114	03.12.2004	05.12.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G06F17/30

Applicant
CAPLIN SYSTEMS LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1*bis*(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas
Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl
Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Denoual, M

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4163

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/GB2004/005114

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

   ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

   a. type of material:

   ☐ a sequence listing

   ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

   b. format of material:

   ☐ in written format

   ☐ in computer readable form

   c. time of filing/furnishing:

   ☐ contained in the international application as filed.

   ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

   ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Box No. II Priority

1. ☐ The following document has not been furnished:

   ☐ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

   ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

   Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☒ The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available to the International Searching Authority at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application,

☒ claims Nos. 11-16, 24

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination *(specify)*:

☐ the description, claims or drawings *(indicate particular elements below)* or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed *(specify)*:

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 11-16, 24

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form	☐	has not been furnished
	☐	does not comply with the standard
the computer readable form	☐	has not been furnished
	☐	does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See separate sheet for further details

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees, the applicant has:

   ☐ paid additional fees.

   ☐ paid additional fees under protest.

   ☒ not paid additional fees.

2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.

3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is

   ☐ complied with

   ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:

   see separate sheet

4. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:

   ☐ all parts.

   ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1-10,17-22,23

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	2-10,17
	No:	Claims	1,18-22,23
Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	
	No:	Claims	1-10,17-23
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-10,17-23
	No:	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

   see separate sheet

Re Item III.

According to Rule 43bis.1.b and Rule 66.1.e PCT, no Written Opinion Of The International Searching Authority has been carried out for claims 11 to 16 and 24 because the claims relate to subject-matter in respect of which no International Search Report has been established.

Re Item IV.

The separate inventions are:

Claims 1-10,17-22,23: A method of retrieving and displaying data from a plurality of data sources

Claims 11-16, 24: A method of handling errors in retrieved data

It must be remarked that claims 17 to 22 are claimed as depending either on the first subject or second subject. For the purpose of this reasoning, they have been included in the first subject.

They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: EP-A-1 209 583 (GRUPPO EUROMEDIA S.R.L) 29 May 2002 (2002-05-29)

2. Document D1 discloses:

A method of providing data from a plurality of remote data servers for concurrent display by a browser (paragraph [0020]), the method comprising the steps of:
receiving a symbol representing a data selection (column 4, lines 2-3, the search string is a symbol representing a data selection);
mapping said symbol to respective symbols used by each of the data servers to represent

said data selection (column 4, line 24-26, by adapting the string to the search engines, the symbol is mapped to the representation of the data servers);
sending the mapped symbols to their respective data servers; receiving data corresponding to the mapped symbols from each of the data servers (paragraphs [0029], it is implicit that the queries are dispatched to the servers); and
displaying the received data concurrently within a browser window (paragraphs [0022], [0028], figure 1).

3. Subject 1 (claims 1-10,17-22,23):

With regard to paragraph 2, claim 1 is fully disclosed in D1.

In D1, the browser window is divided into a plurality of frames, each frame displaying data from one of the data servers (paragraph [0020], figure 1).

The subject-matter of claim 2 differs from the disclosure of D1 in that the following is performed:
- automatically changing the data in one or more of the frames in response to a symbol entered by a user in one of the other of the plurality of frames [holding data from the data servers].

This may be considered as the special technical features (STF-1) of the first invention in the sense of Rule 13 PCT.
From this technical feature, the problem to be solved by the first invention can be construed as: how to enable the method to perform searches in all search engines from one of the search fields of the result frames.

4. Subject 2 (claims 11-16, 24):

The subject-matter of claim 11 differs from the disclosure of D1 in that the following is performed:
- determining whether the response provides a second data selection corresponding to the first data selection.

The other steps are corresponding with another wording to the disclosure in paragraph 2.

This may be considered as the special technical features (STF-2) of the second invention in the sense of Rule 13 PCT.
From these technical features, the problem to be solved by the second invention can be construed as: how to handle errors in the retrieved data.

5. Unity of Invention

The above analysis shows that the special technical features of subjects 1 and 2 are not the same. Furthermore, the objective problems in subject 1 and 2 are different and therefore the special technical features do not correspond.
Therefore, the requirement of Unity of Invention as set up in Rule 13 PCT is not fulfilled.

Re Item V.

1 Document (D1) is also referred to in this communication item:

2 Independent Claims 1, 18 and 23

2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method of providing data from a plurality of remote data servers for concurrent display by a browser (paragraph [0020]), the method comprising the steps of:
receiving a symbol representing a data selection (column 4, lines 2-3, the search string is a symbol representing a data selection);
mapping said symbol to respective symbols used by each of the data servers to represent said data selection (column 4, line 24-26, by adapting the string to the search engines, the symbol is mapped to the representation of the data servers);
sending the mapped symbols to their respective data servers; receiving data corresponding to the mapped symbols from each of the data servers (paragraphs [0029], it is implicit that the queries are dispatched to the servers); and

displaying the received data concurrently within a browser window (paragraphs [0022], [0028], figure 1).

2.2 Since the subject-matter of each of independent claims 18, 23 corresponds to the subject matter of claim 1, the same reasoning as given for claim 1 will apply mutatis mutandis.

Therefore claims 18, 23 also do not meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

2.3 It must be further remarked with regard to the description, that the term "symbol" is not clear (Article 6 PCT). In the description, "symbol" appears to be restricted to stock symbol, where no such restriction appears in the claims. Therefore, the meaning of "symbol" in the claim is obscure. Additionally, it is considered that further restricting the definition of the term "symbol" and as a consequence the term "mapping" would lead the application to meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT. Indeed the type of data would not be considered as limiting the scope of the claim for the purpose of meeting the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT.

3 Dependent Claims 2-10, 17, 19-22
Dependent claims 2-10, 17, 19-22 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).